UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/696,463	10/30/2003	Ming-Tien Lin	HANP0022USA	6011	
27765 7590 11/24/2008 NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION			EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 506		RUDE, TIMOTHY L			
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2871			
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			11/24/2008	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/696,463	LIN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
TIMOTHY RUDE	2871		

	TIMOTHY RUDE	2871	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 October 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ').	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<del></del>	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, k</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d)  They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ul><li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li><li>5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ul>		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/TIMOTHY DUDE!		
	/TIMOTHY RUDE/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2871	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It is respectfully pointed out that status is after final and prosecution is closed. Applicant argues rejections are improper. Examiner has considered all of Applicant's remarks and finds them conclusory in nature. As to objection to claim 34, the drain electrode refers to the drain electrode exclusively; words mean what they say. As to claim 1, Song teaches motivation to minimally add light blocking only as needed to prevent light leakage while maximizing aperture; applying this teaching to APA will result in the claimed light blocking layer widths without undue experimentation and with high probability of success; this renders the claim limitations obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art given APA in view of Song. Applicant argues 34 is drawn to embodiment 2; embodiment 2 is withdrawn from consideration. Applicant misquotes claim 35; please reference Okada. Watanabe is considered robust to teach any of numerous repair line configurations including those claimed. Examiner has considered all of Applicant's arguments and maintains the final rejection is proper. The status of the claims remains unchanged.